R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 389 UD 006 389

EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF AN ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE FOR THE PLACEMENT AND RE-GROUPING OF CHILDREN FROM DEPRESSED AREAS IN AND WITHIN THE UNGRADED PRIMARY UNIT. FINAL REPORT.

BY- CLARKE, EUNICE A.
TEMPLE UNIV., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8142 PUB DATE 31 JAN 68
REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-180
CONTRACT OEC-5-10-107
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.92 71P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *GROUPING (INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES), *UNGRADED CLASSES, *STUDENT PLACEMENT, *STUDENT EVALUATION, PRIMARY GRADES, STUDENT GROUPING, ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, NEGROES, TEACHER ATTITUDES, STUDENT TESTING, EVALUATION METHODS, DATA COLLECTION, ACHIEVEMENT RATING, BIBLIOGRAPHIES,

THIS EXPLORATORY STUDY EXAMINED THE WAYS IN WHICH DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN ARE ASSESSED FOR PLACEMENT AND REGROUPING IN AN UNGRADED PRIMARY UNIT. THE STUDY ALSO ATTEMPTED TO FIND OUT WHETHER THE ADMINISTRATION AND TEACHERS HAD PRECONCEPTIONS ABOUT THE CHILD. FINDINGS ARE BASED ON SURVEYS OF THE DIRECTIVES AND PUBLICATIONS OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT, EXTENSIVE INTERVIEWS, AND INTENSIVE CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS. IT WAS FOUND THAT THE KEY FACTOR IN THE PLACEMENT OF THE PUPILS WAS THE SYSTEM'S TESTING PROGRAM, WHICH WAS ONLY SLIGHTLY INFLUENCED BY TEACHER JUDGMENTS. LESS OBVIOUS INFLUENCES ON TEACHER ASSESSMENT WERE STUDENTS' SKIN COLOR AND SPEECH PATTERNS AND SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS. THE PERSONALITY OF THE TEACHER ALSO AFFECTED ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND STUDENTS' RESPONSES. IT WAS ALSO FOUND THAT BOTH THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE TEACHER USED AN ACHIEVEMENT-INTELLECTUAL MODEL OF THE CHILD IN WHICH INTELLIGENCE IS VIEWED AS INNATE AND WHERE THE CHILD PLAYS A PASSIVE ROLE IN HIS OWN LEARNING EXPERIENCES. A NEED WAS EXPRESSED FOR "USEFUL AND USABLE" QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES. INCLUDED IS A DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND A DISCUSSION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLASSROOM MODELS OF THE UNGRADED PRIMARY UNIT USED IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM UNDER STUDY. THERE IS AN EXTENSIVE APPENDIX CONTAINING THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES AND TEACHER EVALUATION FORMS USED IN THIS STUDY. (NH)

BR-5-8142
P.A. 24
C384
ED019389

FINAL REPORT
Project No. S-180
Contract No. OE-5-10-107

EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF AN ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE FOR THE PLACEMENT AND RE-GROUPING OF CHILDREN FROM DEPRESSED AREAS IN AND WITHIN THE UNGRADED PRIMARY UNIT

January 31, 1968

UD 006 389

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report

Project No. S-180
Contract No. OE-5-10-107

EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF AN ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE FOR THE PLACEMENT AND RE-GROUPING OF CHILDREN FROM DEPRESSED AREAS IN AND WITHIN THE UNGRADED PRIMARY UNIT

Eunice A. Clarke

Temple University

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

January 31, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

UD 006 389

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
Introduction	2
Method	5
Bibliography	12
Data Collection Procedures	15
The Administrative Model	16
Classroom Model	22
Comparison of Administrative and Classroom Model	25
Findings and Analysis	26
Conclusions and Recommendations	29
Abstract	30A

Appendixes

A--Forms	31
B--Reward-Punishment	33
C--Teacher Reenforcement	38
D--Teacher-Attitude Behavior	41
E--Teacher-Parent Conferences Teacher-Teacher Meetings	43
F--Interview Schedule for Administrators	45
G--Administrative View of Assessment Procedures	48
H--Teacher Comments on Assessment Bases To Children During Class	50
I--Interview Schedule for Kindergarten Teachers	52
J--Interview Schedule for First Year Teachers	57
K--Interview Schedule for Third Year Teachers	64

SUMMARY

This is an exploratory study which sought to examine the assessment procedures for the placement and regrouping of children of disadvantaged backgrounds in an ungraded pattern of organization (kindergarten through third). There was an attempt to elicit both a conceptual model of a child from the point of view of the administration and of the teacher. These two models were sought by surveying directives and publications of the school district by a series of extensive interviews and by intensive observation.

It had been hypothesized that pupil placement would be determined by the teacher's consideration of these five variables age, sex, performance level (teacher evaluated) social maturity (teacher defined) and test results of designated instruments. Neither age nor sex played any observable part in the teacher's decisions. Age was a factor, however, where a child had not had a kindergarten experience and his testing was delayed until his entrance to the first year of the primary unit.

The key factor in deciding placement was found to be the testing program of the Central Administration only slightly influenced by teacher judgments and those functioned only within the class units. Skin color, speech patterns and socio-economic factors were subtle but operating factors in teacher assessments. Teacher personality affected the assessment practices and student responses.

Both the administrative model and the classroom model were based in the achievement-intellectual dimension of a child. The teachers operated in either classrooms with greater awareness of the biological and psycho-sociological dimensions and recommendations for placement either depended upon the prescribed tests or considerably shaped by those tests.

The study revealed a real felt and expressed need for useful and usable quantitative assessment procedures as well as a means to utilize all relevant data to determine how to maximize pupil growth and development.

Perhaps most significantly, it revealed that both the administration and the classroom model were based upon an acted-upon view of a child's cognitive dimension. Intelligence was viewed as innate, and potential, as laten, a view that renders the task of the school as awaiting the "readiness" of that intelligence to be receptive to instruction. It sees the child in an inactive role in his own learning. His own affect upon his experiences, his classmates--his world have no influence in his learning. He is rather than always in a state of becoming. Assessment devices are needed to measure not this static view but a wholestic active one.

INTRODUCTION

Since 1848 when the Quincy Grammar School opened in Boston, American education has been held in the lock-step of the graded school plan. Its pattern of one grade-one teacher-one room seemed to bring a high degree of order into a growing school system. This system used age as the criterion for placement. Teachers have struggled within that structure to encourage the learning of the individual child. As research and experience provided more information and understanding about children, educators became increasingly restive with the procedures of "promotion", "retention", "demotion", "grade-skipping". With the development of the standardized testing instruments, educators seized upon the "general intelligence" test as an appropriate assessment device as a guide to individualized instruction and adopted the standard achievement test as a measure of mastery adequate to justify promotion or retention.

In the last three decades, there has emerged an increasing focus on the need for instructional differentiation. Some facets of the learning process can best be maximized in a group situation. Other facets require the opportunity to learn alone at a self-determined pace within freeing and supportive guidelines. Striking evidence of the concern for greater differentiation is the rapid growth of the ungraded unit. This organization pattern has its most widespread adoption at the primary level although there are increasing numbers of ungraded intermediate units. Melbourne High School, Melbourne, Florida is a widely known example of the non-graded high school. Wherever the non-graded unit exists it has been introduced as an organizational device designed to provide greater flexibility in the teaching of children and the opportunity for children to feel the success of learning.

Other evidence of the awareness of the need for differentiation in the instruction process appear in such concerns as those for "the gifted", "the slow learner". Each focus has thrown a searchlight on the problem of pupil assessment. Currently the great thrust to educate the children from depressed areas has turned its own spotlight on this basic problem in education.

If "all the children of all the people" are to be educated in such a way as to maximize their potential and minimize their own personal loss and that of the nation, the clear and strident demand for skillful and employable assessment procedures must be met. If the schools are to begin with children where they really are, and educate them as far

as their potential permits, effective initial and continuing assessment is basic.

We proposed to examine the manner in which a large urban school district assessed pupils for placement in and within the ungraded primary unit. This organizational plan was initiated in this school system in September, 1961, in order better to individualize education procedures. The goal was to minimize failure and maximize successful learning. The focus in this examination was upon children from depressed areas, disadvantaged by their socio-economic background, and the teacher in the school that served them. Nowhere is there greater need for careful assessment than with these children with whom the schools feel they have been less than successful.

Assessment in this context is broadly defined, including both the designated devices, procedures and the informal and often intuitive judgments of the classroom teacher. Furthermore each assessment device and procedure is an expression, an underlying psychological, social psychological or sociological dimension. The aggregate of these dimensions constitutes a "pupil conceptual model", i.e., an array of dimensions which are presumed to be relevant to the understanding, placement and progress of the child. It would seem important to proceed from a delineation of the specific assessment devices to an analysis of the underlying dimensions and the conceptual context. Only then can research test the adequacy of the model against the basic knowledge and theory currently available in the behavioral sciences.

It was proposed that the present exploratory effort might provide a factual basis for the inference of the underlying models utilized by the school district. It was hoped that this kind of exploration would provide groundwork. Sophisticated research could then proceed to the next stage of developing sophisticated models, assessing the adequacy of those models and deriving possibly more effective assessment techniques to be used in the operational setting.

Objectives

There were three objectives:

1. To analyze the formal assessment procedures designated by the Central Administration of a large urban school district to determine pupil placement and progress within the ungraded primary unit with a view to inferring the underlying dimensions of the "pupil conceptual model". Such an analysis sought the answers to the following questions:

a. What are the formal assessment procedures the school district designated in making such pupil judgments, and what are the dimensions of the underlying "pupil conceptual model"?

b. How and to what extent are these procedures operative in (1) initial placement within the primary unit and (2) pupil movement within the primary unit.

2. To analyze the formal and informal assessment procedures employed by the classroom teacher in making pupil placement and progress judgments within the ungraded primary unit with a view to inferring the underlying dimensions of the teacher's "pupil conceptual model". Such an analysis sought the answers to the following questions:

   a. What are the procedures by which the classroom teacher assesses pupil placement and progress, and what are the dimensions of the underlying "pupil conceptual model"?

   b. How and to what extent are such procedures operative in: (1) curriculum content and instructional procedures and (2) the decision-making process involving pupil movement and grouping within the primary unit, and advancement and retention in the primary unit.

3. To compare the formal and informal assessment procedures, and the underlying dimensions of the "administrative" and "classroom pupil conceptual model". Out of such a comparison it was hoped that more specific hypotheses bearing on pupil assessment, both formal and informal, might be sought by the school system which would allow the schools to provide more individualized and differentiated understanding and instruction.

METHOD

This exploratory study is divided into three parts all of which lean heavily upon extrapolation and content analysis.

Part I is an analysis of the "administrative model" which has been based upon (a) A survey of the assessment devices (tests, inventories, etc.) and standard procedures designated by the Central administration for use in the initial placement of children in the continuous progress primary units, and their subsequent regrouping between and within those units. Such data has been gathered from the several offices responsible for such designation. Data from administrative bulletins has been augmented by interview with key administrative personnel. (b) A description of how these devices and procedures were used in pupil placement and regrouping. (c) The extrapolation of the dimensions comprising the underlying "pupil conceptual model" were developed from the data of (a) and (b). Such extrapolation has been essentially drawn from an analysis of the implicit psychological, social psychological and sociological variables upon which the assessment devices and procedures are based.

Part II is an analysis of the "Classroom Model" which has been drawn from (a) A survey of assessment devices and procedures (tests, achievement measures, intuitive judgments, etc.) used by the classroom teacher in determing pupil placement and later regrouping in the continuous progress primary units. (b) A description of how these devices and procedures were used in making pupil placement and regrouping decisions. (c) The extrapolation of the dimensions comprising the underlying "pupil conceptual model" was achieved by (a) and (b) above, interviews observation and participation in teacher discussions.

There are a number of designated decision making periods during the school year at which time teachers of children in the continous progress primary must summarize their understanding of their pupils in order to make judgments on placement and regrouping. The initial point of decision-making occurs when the pupil is ready to be passed from kindergarten into the primary unit. Later points of decision making occur when the primary unit teacher prepares for parent conferences and makes judgments for regrouping. Data on the assessment devices and procedures were elicited from teachers at these points by interview and observation.

The investigator sat in on the required teacher evaluation and recommendation sessions at the kindergarten-primary unit transition point in order to observe and record the bases of the recommendations. These sessions were followed up by interviewing the recommending teacher in order to gain greater insight into the basis for her recommendations.

Within the primary units the investigator interviewed teachers at the several points during the school year when judgments and regrouping decisions were made. The interviews were relatively open-ended and designed to probe the often unspoken bases for judgments and decision making.

Part III consists of a comparison of the "administrative" and "classroom models" based upon the separate analysis of the assessment devices and procedures and underlying behavioral science dimensions. There were twelve teachers whose "assessment behavior" was observed. The assessment behavior of the Kindergarten and First Year Primary Unit teachers was derived from a different student population.

The total pupil population was initially 200: 100 at the First Year Primary Level and 100 at the Third Year Primary Level. By the end of the study there were 177; a loss of thirteen at kindergarten and ten at third.

The interview data was analyzed for each teacher, for the group as a whole. The pattern permitted the compilation of responses. Inasmuch as this study was exploratory there was sufficient flexibility to reshape the interview foci as the study developed. It was hypothesized that teacher decisions will be based on at least five variables: age, sex, performance level (teacher evaluated), social maturity (teacher defined), test results of designated instruments.

On the basis of these and other the relevant variables which emerged there was an attempt to develop gross weightings for their relative importance in the decision making process. The individual difference between teachers as revealed later interviews are charted and described.

The study was initiated during June when the Kindergarten teachers make recommendations to the succeeding First Year Primary Unit teacher. During the following academic year, the First and Third Year Primary teachers were interviewed three times, once with the schedule included here as the first "formal" interview, once in a taped discussion and once simply conversation with note-taking.

The teacher population was drawn from: (1) Schools that serve depressed inner city areas. (2) Teachers who held the same position during the school year prior to the initiation of the study.

Four kindergarten teachers will be selected: (1) One teacher who recommends in a school with a single ungraded primary unit. (2) One teacher who recommends in a school containing two ungraded units. (3) One teacher who recommends in a school containing three ungraded primary units. (4) One teacher who recommends in a school containing four or more such units.

Four teachers of first year primary units being recommended to by the kindergarten teachers were selected on the same basis as the kindergarten teachers.

Four teachers of third year primary units were selected in the same manner. The pupil population was drawn from the entering primary unit. From 1964-65 (25 pupils per teacher): 100 each level; from entering primary unit of 1962-63 (25 pupils per teacher): 100 each level.

Survey Procedures

In a large school system the quantity of bulletins, curriculum guides, special memoranda issued even within one school year is overwhelming. Although each of the publications was read during the course of this exploratory study, the extrapolation of the "administrative model" confined itself to five key items. Each of these central administration publications relates specifically to the Continuous Progress Primary thereby providing a realistic source for comparison with teacher assessment devices and procedures teaching within that pattern of school organization (Appendixes A, H, I, J, K).

In the analysis of teacher assessment practices, the skill drill tests were simply noted except where they revealed themselves to be the overwhelming decision-making factor or where they were so few as to indicate the teachers dependence upon some other factor or factors. Teacher tests, however, either oral or written were utilized extensively. Their content, format, grading and their instructions were analyzed. Where teachers used activities as assessment devices, these received careful attention as to their purpose, content and the evaluation of their performance (Appendix A).

Observation Procedures

Teachers were observed in three settings (1) in the classroom with children (2) during the parent conference (3) during meetings with teachers into whose group the children would move.

The observation during the regular classroom activities utilized two very simple instruments which attempted to ascertain for what and how pupils were rewarded, for what and how they were punished and what means of reinforcement were exhibited by the teacher. (Appendixes B, C, H)
These instruments served to elicit dimensions of the teacher's view of a child which she could not or would not articulate. Records were kept as to what the teacher told the children she was using to assess growth or the lack of it.

in which they reported eighty-nine such school districts. (12) The difference here seems to lie in the more narrow definition of the ungraded primary. Dean's estimate is considerably higher. He reports seven hundred and seventy-six urban areas as using the ungraded primary sequence. (7)

The NEA indicates that the institution of these non-graded units has followed upon the heels of a school district's attempt to meet problems of learning and pupil placement which have refused solution under the traditional graded system. (19) As an example of the reasons for the shift to the ungraded pattern, Goodlad and Anderson cite that the usual first grade pupil pattern includes a four year differential in mental age, an equally great range in achievement and the lack of correlation with mental age. (13) Nor is there any guarantee necessarily of similar levels of achievement in all subject areas for any one child within the September to June time period.

As reported by Goodlad and Anderson, the reasons for the adoption of the ungraded unit fall into three main categories: (1) the increased opportunity to individualize instruction, (2) the greater flexibility in pupil placement and regrouping and (3) the augmented opportunity for curriculum revision and improvement. (12) Inherent in each of these reasons is the emphasis upon providing children with the opportunity to develop their potential as fully as possible with appropriate materials and at their own learning pace. There has been much discussion of the improved mental health for pupils with the removal of the formal grade-by-grade promotion policy, thus providing a better learning climate. (3, 14, 5)

A survey of the materials from thirty-two school districts made by this investigator reveals that in twenty-seven of them pupil reading level, either readiness or achievement is the primary judgmental factor in pupil placement and re-grouping. The extensiveness of the discussion of reading in all of the literature indicates a heavy emphasis upon reading skill. This is often accompanied by either formal or informal judgments of social maturity and far less often by an evaluation of the achievement level in arithmetic skills. Significant in most of the literature on the ungraded primary is the absence of any great concern or clear-cut recommendations for the processes by which children are placed or regrouped within the ungraded unit. As thorough and analysis as that of Clark, and of Goodlad and displays a remarkable omission of a discussion of assessment procedures in this context, although great attention is paid to evaluation *per se* and to the processes of reporting pupil progress. (6, 13) Even such a specialized focus as Johnson's focus on the slow learner elicits no analysis or recommendations for assessment at the primary level. (16) The question recurs as to whether reading level, however important, is as adequate an assess-

The observations made during the parent conference and the teacher to teacher meeting focussed only upon whether the teacher emphasized achievement level or behavior patterns of the children. A simple running number count was made on the teacher's comments. (Appendix E)

Interview Procedures

All teachers involved in each school were met with as a group during which time the purpose and methodology of the study was outlined and explained. Each teacher was asked about her willingness and interest in participating. Several had suggestions of how they could help. The first "formal" interview had specific questions asked (Appendixes I,J,K) All other interviews were of a discussion type with questions emerging out of the setting (parent or teacher conference). Casual conversations following observations were also analyzed from supporting or divergent material. Because the study was exploratory it was essential both to be flexible and to seize unexpected opportunities to listen to the teachers.

Interviews with administrators were open-ended but more directed. They related to the specific administrative slot held by the person interviewed. (Appendixes F, G)

Review of Related Literature

Since the full scale adoption of the graded elementary school organization pattern began in 1848, there have been many attempts to modify its structure and to introduce totally new patterns with a view to providing greater flexibility. (20) Beginning in the early nineteen thirties, professional literature has revealed an increasing interest in the ungraded pattern. This increase is particularly evident since World War II, with the focus upon the primary years.

The Slater study in 1955 revealed that there were at that time non-graded primary units in twenty states, most of which had been put into operation during the nineteen forties. (21) In 1959, the Research Division of the National Education Association made a survey of fourteen hundred and ninety-five urban school districts to determine the extensiveness of the use of the non-graded pattern. Out of the eight hundred and nineteen school districts responding, seventy-one indicated that their organization was of either nongraded or the primary block type. On their weighted estimates, they concluded that there were approximately two hundred and thirty school districts using such a plan. (18) Goodlad, in a letter in April, 1961, to the Research Division of the NEA reported the use of the ungraded primary in approximately one hundred and twenty-five school districts. This is a higher estimate than the one reported by Goodlad and Anderson a year later

ment device as is needed.

Stendler makes some telling statements in her discussion of the ungraded primary when she expresses serious doubts as to its advantages. She questions the adequacy of group testing patterns for placement purposes.

She believes that the initial placements are retained regardless of any error involved and that teachers do not in fact make the kinds of adjustments that are actually possible in the ungraded organization pattern. She feels that the only change has been from rigid grade standards to equally rigid level standards. (22)

Goodlad and Anderson, whose work in this field is truly authoritative, indicate the great potential of the ungraded pattern and the regret that as yet in all too many cases, it remains an organizational pattern rather than an instructionally flexible learning situation. Carbone's work indicates that teachers tend not to alter their teaching or grouping style. (4,5) This is not surprising when one considers that the assessment procedures and the evaluation techniques are either totally unchanged or not significantly altered. Where the school systems have abandoned the ungraded unit, they seem to have done so with a high degree of regret, listing as the reasons for such abandonment excessively high enrollment figures, parental lack of understanding of the ungraded pattern and the inability of the teachers themselves to make use of the flexibility inherent in the system. (6) Clearly, the last two reasons rest upon an inadequacy that could be dealt with were the teacher in possession of adequate means by which she could make and justify both pattern and movement of pupils.

Even as analytical and critical a treatment as Carbone's ignores the basic question of careful and accurate assessment. It is significant that while all of the literature deals with the problem and promise of individualized instruction, there is little by way of real direction in the area of appropriate assessment techniques. (see footnote) Quite clearly, if the problem has not been dealt with for the "normal" children, the problem can only be made more acute in the children who come from disadvantaged backgrounds and from depressed areas. Even the early work of such people as Martin Deutsch (8, 9) has pointed to the special problems of such children. Earlier work by Eels, Davis, Havighurst, Herrick and Tyler, alert the educator to

---

(footnote--Recent work by Ira Gordon gives some hope in this area.

the criticality of dealing with these children in general. (10) Place them in a learning situation which is designed to meet their individual learning problem and the need for careful assessment of their potential and growth becomes even more evident. The literature dealing with the wide range of areas of deprivation raise the question of how adequately is the assessment process handled. When Carbone's study reveals that (1) there is no significant difference in achievement between comparable groups of students who attended graded and non-graded primary schools, (2) that there is no significant difference in mental health and (3) that there were no identifiable differences in instructional practices of teachers in graded and non-graded schools, the question recurs as to why a format which encourages all three should fall short.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR NON-GRADED CLASSROOM

1. Anderson, Robert H. "The Development of Behavior and Personality." The Nation's Children, Vol. 2, 1960, p. 61.

2. Anderson, Robert H. "Ungraded Primary Classes and Administrative Contribution to Mental Health." Understanding the Child, June, 1955.

3. Carbone, Robert F. "Achievement Mental Health and Instruction in Graded and Non-Graded Elementary Schools." (Unpublished)

4. Carbone, Robert F. "A Comparison of Graded and Non-Graded Elementary Schools." Elementary School Journal, Vol. 62, November, 1962.

5. Carbone, Robert F. "The Non-Graded School: An Appraisal." Administrators Notebook, Vol. X, No. 1 Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1961

6. Clark, Charles W. The Ungraded Primary School. Curriculum Bulletin No. 208, Vo. XVI School of Education, University Of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, November, December, 1960.

7. Dean, Stuart E. Elementary School Administration and Organization. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1960, No. 11, Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office.

8. Deutsch, Martin. "Revising Deprivation Effects in the Pre-school Child." Mimographed paper submitted to Special Projects section, National Institute of Mental Health, June, 1962.

9. Deutsch, Martin. "Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement." Monograph #2, Society for Applied Anthropology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1960.

10. Eels, Kenneth, A. Davis, R. Havighurst, V. Herrick and R. Tyler. "Intelligence and Cultural Difference." University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1952.

11. Filbin, Robert L. "Continuous Progress for All: Implications for the High School." The American School Board Journal. October, 1961.

12. Goodlad, John and Robert Anderson. "Educational Practices in Non-Graded Schools: A Survey of Perception." Elementary School Journal. October, 1962.

13. Goodlad, John E. and Robert Anderson. The Non-Graded Elementary School. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1959.

14. Goodlad, John E. "Promising Practices in Non-Graded Schools." Educational Digest. Vol. 27, October, 1961.

15. Hunt, J. McV. Intelligence and Experience. Ronald Press Co., New York, 1961.

16. Johnson, G. Orville. Education for the Slow Learners. Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1963.

17. Morse, Arthur D. Schools of Tomorrow--Today. Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1960.

18. National Education Association, Research Division. Administrative Practices in Urban School Districts, 1958-59. Research Report 1961-R10. Washington, D. C: the Association, May, 1961.

19. National Education Association Research Division. Non-Grading: A Modern Practice in Elementary School Organization. Research Memo, 1961-37. The Association, October, 1961.

20. Otto, Henry J. "Elementary Education III: Organization and Administration." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, editor Walter S. Munroe, Rev. Ed., New York. Macmillan, 1959, p. 372.

21. Slater, Eva May. The Primary Unit. Curriculum Bulletin #3. School of Education, University of Connecticut, Curriculum Center, Storrs, Connecticut.

22. Stendler, Celia B. "Grouping Practices." Those First School Years. 1960 Yearbook, Washington, D. C.,: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1960.

SELECTED AND SPECIFIC BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR TEACHER BEHAVIOR OBSERVATION SCALES

23. Flanders, Ned A. Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement. Washington, Cooperative Research Monograph No. 12, 1965.

24. Gordon, Ira J. Studying the Child in School. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.

25. Perkins, H. "A Procedure for Assessing the Classroom Behavior of Students and Teachers." American Research Journal, 1964, I, pp. 249-259.

Data Collection Procedures

Data for this study came from the following sources:

Survey materials were obtained from the central administration, the district offices, the principals and teachers.

Interviews were scheduled as follows:

Four principals
Three district superintendents
Three associate superintendents
Each of these persons were interviewed with the five item schedule (Appendix F) for one half hour each.
Each of these persons were interviewed open-ended style on assessment on three separate occasions with time limited to one hour.
Twelve teachers were interviewed
first as a group in each school to discuss the study
second the questions listed in Appendix
third a one hour taped "conversation" about assessment and children

Observations

Each of the twelve teachers were observed in the classroom on fifteen (15) separate occasions. Minimum time per observation one hour. Maximum time per observation three hours. Each of the twelve teachers were observed during six parent conferences.
Each of the twelve teachers were observed during four teacher to teacher(s) conferences.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE MODEL

The Continuous Progress Primary ungraded unit of organization was adopted by the school system because of these advantages as enumerated in the publication "Directions for Implementation".[1]

A. This plan provides for continuous pupil growth at each pupil's individual rate of achievement.
B. Through flexible grouping, each group, within limits imposed by the organization pattern, is composed of those pupils most nearly alike in as many facts of development as possible, thus effecting a narrowed range of abilities and achievement.
C. Repetition of a year's work is eliminated.

Note here the emphasis upon "achievement". The definition of achievement becomes clear in the succeeding pages of the same publication when it states:

> "3. To facilitate grouping, to insure a reasonable degree of uniformity throughout the system, and to provide a common basis for evaluation reading achievement (in terms of reading levels) will be used as a major criterion."[2]

The other major criterion is arithmetic achievement which, like the reading achievement, is divided into nine levels. Although the publication notes that such factors as "chronological age", "stage of adjustment to school demands" "physical and social maturity" should influence grouping.[3]

---

[1]"The Continuous Progress Primary Unit" "Direction for Implementation I", Philadelphia Public Schools, The Continuous Progress Primary Unit Committee, Philadelphia June 1961, Reprinted 196 p. 1.

[2]Ibid., p. 2.

[3]Ibid., p. 2.

The pattern of initial grouping is clearly defined by the central administration by the assignment of pupils on the basis of the Philadelphia Verbal Ability Test (R 318-June 1961) (Appendix). This test, given in kindergarten, assigns an I. Q. for each child although it gives I. Q.'s in ten point intervals only. Directions for the test that teachers[4] should make a ten point allowance in interpreting the I. Q. All other children entering the Primary unit are admitted on the basis of chronological age. They are then administered the same test in the second or third week of September. It is to be noted that this test is a verbal ability test. All other tests emanating from the Division of Research are achievement tests. Throughout the publication indicating how the Continuous Primary Unit organization is to be implemented is the implicit and explicit criterion of achievement, of the division of children into slow, average and rapid learners. These reveal an assumption that a child is a "learner", that his learning is measurable by fact and information tests and that readiness to learn can be most adequately measured by a test of verbal ability.

Although the Continuous Progress Primary organization was adopted for reasons of flexibility, a necessary element in the individualization of learning, the reality of the situation reveals a kindergarten to first to second to third year pattern. Note the statements from the Implementation document.

> "To meet city-wide organization needs and to provide the essentials for record-keeping, it seems desirable to designate particular times during the school year when pupil placement conferences are to be held. The period immediately preceding the issuance of the Pupil Progress Report seems to offer certain advantages. This is the time when the evaluation of pupil progress will occur, since the teacher must prepare the Progress Report. (emphasis investigator's)
>
> "In all probability, relatively little change in inter-class grouping will occur in the fall when the first Porgress Report is issued. More such grouping will probably occur at mid-year. Again a very little amount of inter-class grouping is to be expected with the spring issue of the Progress Report. The most extensive regrouping

---

[4]Form R 320, Philadelphia Verbal Ability Test (K, 1) General Directions.

is to be expected in June when the school year ends.[5] (emphasis investigator's)

Not only are children assigned on the basis of verbal ability, their learning pace is assumed to coincide with the facts that children are assigned on the basis of a group I. Q. test, that their progress and group assignment are measured in terms of reading level with arithmetic achievement a lower level second criterion and you have a sharply limited view of child. This is particularly significant when it is remembered that the Continuous Progress Primary unit was adopted to provide for "continuous pupil growth at each pupil's rate of achievement".[6] No where in the Continuous Progress Primary is the idea of a "continuing teacher" recommended. If a teacher remains for more than one year with a group, it is happenstance and exists because a teacher has requested it and a principal has approved. Even where there would be possibilites of regrouping in a larger school, the criteria direct decisions to be made as to learning pace.

> "Two class groups would allow one to be composed of the slower learners and the slower of the average learners, while the second would be composed of faster learners and the faster of the average learners."[7]

In the first publication describing the "levels in reading and arithmetic one through four" the organization of learning is clearly defined

> "Each level embodies carefully delineated areas of learning arranged in progressive stages. Such an arrangement of sequential skills and subject matter eliminates grade restrictions and permits continuous growth according to the individual's ability and rate of learning."[8]

---

[5] Op. Cit., p. 2-3.

[6] Ibid., p. 1.

[7] Ibid., p. 8.

[8] The Continuous Progress Primary, Description of Levels in Reading and Arithmetic Levels 1-4, The Continuous Progress Primary Committee, February, 1962, reprinted November, 1962, February, 1963, October, 1963, p. 1.

It is important to know that these levels are identified as Teaching Levels. The publication indicates that a small number of children may complete all levels one through eight and level nine (reading has level nine as enrichment; arithmentic has level nine as more practice in computation skills and "intensified and varied drill"[9] in two years, most in three (as if first, second, third grade) and some in four years. However, in "all basic skills of computation and problem-solving must be presented to these children by the end of three years."[10] Indeed, "Instructional objectives at all levels must be presented by the end of four years."[11]

The assessment for the initial placement of a child in a group in the Continuous Progress Primary is based upon his performance in what is used as an I. Q. test. If he does not take this test during his kindergarten experience, he is placed according to his chronological age until he has taken the I. Q. test. Although this test is scheduled for either the second or third week in September, some children are not tested until the end of October. Unless there is some troublesome problem about his placement, he is apt to remain in his original group. This is almost certain to be the case if he falls into that wide category of "average". This was less true in the larger school utilized in this study because of the presence of guidance (testing) personnel and a principal who encouraged movement of pupils.

Despite the concern expressed for the child with a lower socio-economic background and a high degree of sensitivity to the educational implications of their problems, the administrative conceptual model of a child emerges in simplistic terms. The child is a disembodied brain to be taught, to be tested, to be passed, to be failed. The assessment procedures and instruments seek to measure what factual knowledge a child possesses, at what level of proficiency are his basic skills and what skills and information he has yet to master. There is nothing in the administrative assessment procedures that relates to Prescotts insistence that "every child is unique"[12] and his belief

---

[9]Ibid., p. 4.

[10]Ibid., p. 3.

[11]Ibid., p. 4.

[12]Prescott, Daniel A., The Child in the Educative Process, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1957, p. 377.

that classrooms "are places where children and youth systematically learn important knowledges and skills that prepare them to earn a living, to be socially responsible, and to enjoy the better things in life."[13] Conversations revealed that the administrative understandings and educational point of view may well be different from the image projected by the procedures, but the deeply felt and universally expressed need for quantitative data to justify actions, to suggest directions produced a single focus a mastery of--performance view of the child.

It is significant that in this presumably flexible pattern of organization, every child is expected to

(1) be placed initially on the basis of I. Q. which assumes
   a. that the I. Q. test as given is an adequate assessment
   b. that learners are homogeneous within the classifications of slow average and above average (or gifted).

(2) master all "Levels" of designated work (same concepts, same material, same skills) either more slowly (four years) or more rapidly (two years).

(3) reveal his competencies, proficiencies and abilities by means of the prescribed tests for reading and arithmetic, augmented by teacher tests.

(4) have his group placements based only upon his reading skills first supplemented by his proficiency in arithmetic.

(5) fit his need, his learning style, his stage of socialization into a prescribed curriculum.

(6) tested as if he were either not unique at all or that his uniqueness was of no importance to his achievement and growth.

(7) demonstrate his creativity only after he has completed the first eight required levels of mastery and to display it in

---

[13] Ibid., p. 279.

> the reading area mostly by way of academic expression[14] and totally academic in arithmetic[15] thereby indicating that pupil assessment is based upon mastery with no recognition of either cognitive style or development. A value is placed upon creativity only after prescribed mastery which denies the possible existence of an innovative self in the child's growth and development.

This is what the procedures, the assessment devices project and regardless of the differing views as expressed by administrative personnel, the incontrivertible fact remains that these are the procedures which assess a child. He is a being without biological and psychological dynamics; he is a being apart from his areas of socialization. He is a being on whom the focus is teaching, not learning, on the mastery of prescribed skills and information not cognitive achievement, style, growth and development. He is a receiver, not a participator. He is two facets of one dimension; the dimension being his capability of responding to Teaching Levels; the facets being reading and arithmetic ability.

---

[14]Continuous Progress Primary Committee, Op. cit., p. 5-6.

[15]Continuous Progress Primary Committee, Op. cit., p. 7-8.

Classroom Model

Because there is an underlying assumption on the part of the administration that teachers will augment the prescribed asessment measures, the importance of the teacher designed and teacher employed techniques must be emphasized. In a word, it is in the classroom that a child is assessed and it is the teacher who evaluates. Whether their assessment is the deciding factor is another issue.

The teachers in this study were expected to make use of their own evaluation techniques by the central administration and by their own principal. No teacher was told how to weigh her own assessments in relation to administrations devices. Clearly there was no need to do so. Every publication emphasized the central testing procedure; every form provided space for their recording. Although this is to be expected, the significant reading is that teachers within their own day-to-day operation rely heavily on their own devices in some cases defiantly, in others, simply pragmatically. (Appendix A)

In the content of teacher-designed paper test instruments, in their administration in their grading and in discussing them on their return to the pupils, all twelve teachers were aware of the feelings of the children and used that knowledge. Sometimes the use was positive; sometimes it was negative; sometimes, supportive; sometimes, destructive. In every case the teachers gave evidence of seeing the child in a psycho-social dimensions as well as cognitive ones. Only one teacher was consciously aware of cognitive style, even though all twelve talked about how children learn.

The parent interviews not only forced teachers to speak about behavior and its causes but also forced them to link the child's background with his classroom performance. Although all teachers were not understanding of the impact of a child's total life style and life space on his learning in school, all of them saw their pupils in the context of his family and home.

The teacher-to-teacher sessions dealt with the child as a whole with some teachers emphasizing the cognitive and others the intra and inter personal.

Teacher Tests

Teacher tests fell into three categories

1. The basic drills on numbers and words--written and oral.

2. The information retention evaluations written and oral

3. The performance or activity type for individuals and for groups

The basic drills took their substance from the required curricula for each level and geared to aid achievement in the required areas. Kindergarten level necessarily limited here. They consisted of the routine types of word study, recognition, pronunciation, comprehension and the clear stress on computation once number recognition had been established. The significance of these tests lay in the way in which they were used and the teacher attitude in dealing with them. All twelve teachers who were part of this study emphasized by word and action that the tests were "to help" the children "learn". Even when such drills were assigned as punishment, they were described as "helpful" "important" and the way to prevent future error.

Intrinsically they carried very little weight as a determining factors in the grouping and re-grouping process. They were used, however, to gauge the children's needs and provided some direction for teacher planning. On two occasions only, within a classroom (first year group) the level of mastery revealed by these drills served to change the child's grouping.

The oral drills played a greater role in assessment. This, however, was not intentional. The oral drill created an ongroing interaction process that often revealed teacher feelings.

The information retention tests were clearly critical items in the teachers' evaluation of the pupils. This was particularly so in reading where comprehension was stressed and in kindergarten where directions were to be followed. These tests did influence and change groupings within class units. During the course of the study thirty-seven (37) children were regrouped as a result of this type of teacher-designed test. In two cases, children were allowed to work on their own. Teachers placed much more faith in their own assessment instruments in their classroom operation than they believed they did as expressed in their interviews. Outside the classroom they compared their view of a child's ability with the I. Q. or other standard tests. When they made these comparisons they explained the discrepancies in terms of dimensions of the child other than tested intelligence. They emphasized home conditions first, the child's personal-psycho-social problems and his non-academic strengths and weaknesses.

The performance type assessment device was most useful to kindergarten and first year teachers. Activities were utilized as directed by the curriculum guides but teachers had their own for motor development, creativity opportunity, social skills, relationships with others both children and adults. As children neared placement in fourth grade, teachers relied less on these kinds of tests for placement but expressed greater concern for their exclusion.

The classroom conceptual model emerges as a far more rounded one. By every measure used, teachers defined children not only as beings with mental capacity, but beings whose home, parents, siblings, peers, other adults made a difference in how they functioned. They were aware of the biological factors and had some feeling for the influence of chronological age. To the teachers, a child was multi-faceted, a person whose progress was to be assessed often, with regard for the individuality of the child and for the purpose of encouraging his growth and development. Eight of the twelve teachers expressed the view that a child is a child, not a small adult.

Comparison of Administrative and Classroom Models

The immediate factor that stands out is the singularity of the administrative emphasis on as intelligence or brain-oriented view of a child. This is not to say that children are not given health examinations and psychological services. That they do receive these services makes assessment by test of intelligence and achievement even more notable. That children are grouped by way of these assessment procedures routinely and matter-of-factly underscores the unencumbered view of the child-as-learner-in-a-vacuum.

The classroom model on the other hand recognizes in its daily operation the child in his world, in his body, his emotions. Teacher records (non-prescribed) include everything from notes to remember that a child needs glasses, shoes, a dress to a sensitive comment "Gary smiled today" and "Susan has a friend".

Despite these seemingly divergent views, both the administrator and the teacher ultimately assess growth by the same measures and group pupils on the same bases. Although the learning climate may be warmed by displayed sensitivity to the many sided view of a child while he is in the classroom, his individuality is denied by his restricted movements and his many-sidedness constrained into placement by his test ability. In essence and in fact the administrative model prevails while the bulk of the administrators agree with the teachers' views and the teachers bow to the system.

Findings and Analysis

Results and Findings

Although it could have been expected, it was clearly demonstrated that the teacher, however knowledgeable, sensitive and creative in her classroom, is restricted or freed by the pupil conceptual model held by the central administration. Hours of listening, observing and analyzing found teachers functioning on a daily basis from their own view of their pupils. Their recommendations for placement of pupils to the next receiving teacher, however much couched in child study and child development terms, ultimately found their base in the non-teacher designed tests. Where they sought support from their own experience with children, they again depended on quantitative data which focussed on academic achievement.

What the study had not hypothesized was the influence of skin color, socio-economic factors, speech style and previous experience with siblings. Observations revealed feelings of Negro teachers with Negro children. In five cases Negro teachers displayed open rejection of black skinned children while displaying acceptance of lighter skinned Negro children. In the case of these five teachers there was no discernible attitude toward white children. Two Negro teachers displayed particular concern and patience for very dark skinned children. One of the two also displayed the same kinds of concern and evidences of patience with two visually handicapped children who wore glasses.

Children who were not clean by teacher standards tended to be grouped together by one teacher. Where wide divergence of proficiency made such a grouping obviously dysfunctional, the teacher devised work-alone periods.

Essentially intra-class grouping was based on performance of the pupils in the Teaching Levels of reading and math designated by the central administration. For all the differences of expressions about children the teachers' view of the child lacks any real operating understanding of cognitive style and development or any functioning level of appreciation of the socio-psychological dynamics of child growth and development. Reward and punishment reveal a focus upon the achievement of a child measured in terms of skill and information proficiency and are accorded out of the teacher's personality construct.

Teachers revealed a restiveness about the assessment procedures and instruments and either struggled within the confines of the administrative decisions or resigned themselves to the "system". Three of the teachers most creative in their classrooms were surprisingly unaware of the restrictions the system placed upon them. They were

completely immersed in their planning for the children in their classes. All three, significantly, had above average groups where the conflict was at a minimum.

The teachers within their classroom maintain a conceptual model of a child as an active, learning organism with biological, psycho-sociological dimensions who lives in a changing world, who has experiences she has not had and whose level of achievement is as much influenced by all of these as it is by his native intelligence. This is particularly true during the more evenly paced periods of the school year. Pressures mount toward June when hard decisions must be made. I. Q. and achievement scores take on the major decision making roles as the teacher classroom model yields to the large system administrative model.

Throughout the study it was evident that both administration and teachers held essentially the same conceptualization of a child. The teacher's operational view is an augmented one, not a different one. Both viewed the child as having been born with a certain latent potential and therefore the task of the school was (1) to discover that potential or capacity via a careful testing procedure and (2) to utilize that potential in such a way as to lead the child down predictable paths of development. This is essentially an "acting-upon" model. Yet the observations made here clearly demonstrated to the investigator that the classroom is not to be viewed as a simple interaction process. The child's potential, his intelligence is constantly in a modifiable state not only by the "facts" he encounters, the teacher he lives with and the children in his class but also and more particularly by his own affect on each of these. This is a dynamic view as opposed to a static one.

The static view of both administration and teachers speaks of "readiness" as though there were a kind of mystique about it that emanated from having lived a certain period of time. "Readiness" in the view exists along the continuum of a child's life and that readiness in learning areas natural sequence. This view makes the job of the school much more simple. The tasks are set, held in waiting until that magic moment of "readiness" when learning can take place. The real challenge to be met is how the teacher can develop readiness and enhance ability. This means, of course, that assessment proceeds not with the view that it is a measure of the child's given intelligence nor a measure of how far it has been developed. It means a measure of where he is in his state of "becoming" to use Allport's word.

What appears to be inhibiting in the administrative and classroom conceptual model is this static view of a child's potential. It perceives the intelligence as an entity acted upon by family, life style, biological structure--indeed all conditions of a child's life. What seems more nearly true is that the intelligence of the child is all those things. It is therefore modifiable malleable not only by outside focus but by the affect of the child himself. Such a view requires assessment procedures which recognize the composite and active nature of that intelligence and its functioning.

The experiences of this study suggest that it is not only the assessment of the child that is necessary but an assessment of the total situation--the child, his teacher, his classmates and the learning situation itself. A child learns himself, his teacher, his peers, his context. Only an assessment of these can give any real insight into who, what and where he is as a learner. It is not sufficient to measure the product of a child's insight. It is essential that we be able to understand what the experience of insight does to the child's increasing capacity to learn, how he reorganizes his world, how he re-orients himself for succeeding experiences.

It was observable that those teachers who utilized all that they know of a child had the greatest success. They were even more successful in encouraging learning when intiutively they seemed aware of movement, change and responsiveness as growth and readiness and adjusted their teaching method and style accordingly.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This exploratory study pointed up the critical need for quantitative assessment procedures and devices which are freeing to the teacher and solid enough to utilize in making judgments about where pupils are, how far they have progressed and what their next experiences should be.

It pointed up that in the absence of adequate assessment devices an ungraded pattern of organization is not only not ungraded but is likely tc be even more restrictive on the individualization of instruction. It pointed up also that where there is a lack of real assessment techniques, teachers can be and are creative in devising them for their own use. It illustrated also that despite their desire to utilize assessment techniques which more nearly suit the needs of the child, much of their devices are modifications of achievement tests.

The study implicitly reveals that the school system made no adjustments for children from the inner city.* The tests were the same, the groupings made on the same bases, the instructional levels in reading and arithmetic the same throughout the system.

What is needed is concentrated work by researchers to devise useful and usable assessment techniques and procedures. The child study work of Daniel Prescott may be able to "tease out" certain measurable dimensions of a child. The work of Ira Gordon holds promise as does the work done for New York City by the Educational Testing Service.

The truly nongraded organization offers the children from disadvantaged backgrounds a better opportunity to utilize their experience and encourage their growth and development. Anything less is restricting and dysfunctional.

Teachers must be made aware of the role that their own personal reactions and personality construct play in their assessment and grouping of children. Teachers of children from disadvantaged backgrounds particularly must be conscious of their verbal and non-verbal communication patterns. The observations made for this study revealed sharply how these communications functioned in the self-grouping of children and their reactions to teacher groupings.

---

*Happily this school system has undergone a revolution on which the investigator played a role. The situation described here no longer obtains.

APPENDIX D.--ERIC REPORT RESUME

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

(TOP)

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER | RESUME DATE — — | P.A. | T.A.

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☐

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

001 TITLE EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF AN ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE FOR THE
100 PLACEMENT AND RE-GROUPING OF CHILDREN FROM DEPRESSED AREAS
101 IN AND WITHIN THE UNGRADED PRIMARY UNIT.
102
103

200 PERSONAL AUTHOR S Clarke, Eunice A.

300 INSTITUTION SOURCE Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Pa. - C. of Ed. - ~~Ctr. for Comm.~~ Studies — SOURCE CODE

310 REPORT/SERIES NO. — OTHER SOURCE — SOURCE CODE

320

330 OTHER REPORT NO. — OTHER SOURCE — SOURCE CODE

340

350 OTHER REPORT NO.

400 PUB'L. DATE — — — CONTRACT GRANT NUMBER OE-5-10-107

500 PAGINATION ETC
501 67

600 RETRIEVAL TERMS
601
602
603
604
605
606

607 IDENTIFIERS

800 ABSTRACT
801
802
803
804
805 See Attached 30A
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822

Abstract

This exploratory study attemtps to examine the formal and informal assessment procedures and judgments employed by the administration and teachers of a large urban school system to determine pupil placement and progress within an ungraded primary unit. The study sought to infer dimensions of a "pupil conceptual model" from the administrators view and from the teachers. The schools selected were inner city schools. The data were collected via a survey, the publications of the school system, extensive interviewing and classroom observation. Of five variables hypothesized as influencing teacher decisions, two were not significantly operative--age and sex of pupils. The ungraded primary unit was selected as the unit of organization in which the study would take place because it had been introduced into the school system to encourage individualization of instruction. Although class grouping proved to be based upon test-taking, less obvious criteria for intraclass grouping emerged. Skin tone as well as race, speech patterns, size, and experience with siblings were operative. Teacher style as to reward, punishment and personal reenforcement of both proved to be indicators of teacher shifts of pupils in and out of groups. The study revealed no awareness in the procedures for assessment by the system of the nature of the problems of the inner city child. It concludes that there is a felt need for quantitative assessment devices which are freeing, not inhibiting.

It further concludes that any assessment procedure must view the child's intelligence and potential as not an "intelligence" entity but as the ever-changing composite of a developing intelligence upon which the child has affect and which includes his home, his own physiology and the world he changes by his own actions.

Appendix A

FORMS

List of Forms Used in Study

1. Cumulative Record
2. Handwriting Test (1, 2)
3. Philadelphia Verbal Ability Test (K, 1) - General Directions
4. Philadelphia Verbal Ability Test (K, 1)
5. Reading Test (1) Form A
6. Fundamentals of Arithmetic Test (1)
7. Fundamentals of Arithmetic Test (2-Feb.)
8. Fundamentals of Arithmetic (2-Feb.) Directions
9. Philadelphia Verbal Ability Test (2-4) Form A - General Directions and Scoring Key
10. Philadelphia Verbal Ability Test (2-4) Form A, Part 1
11. The Continuous Progress Primary Unit - Directions for Implementation I
12. The Continuous Progress Primary - Description of Levels - In Reading and Arithmetic--Levels 1 - 4
13. The Continuous Progress Primary - Description of Levels - In Reading and Arithmetic--Levels 5 - 8
14. The Continuous Progress Primary - Description of Levels - In Reading and Arithmetic--Level 9
15. Continuous Progress Primary - Pupil Placement Form
16. School C Form
17. District II - Checklist of Reading Skills and Basic Reading Record

Appendix B

REWARD-PUNISHMENT

MEANS OF REWARD-PUNISHMENT
(HOW GIVEN)

REWARD	QUANTITATIVE		NON-QUANTITATIVE			
	Number or Letter Grades	Stars, Checks	Special Privileges	Display of work to class guests, parents	Notes to Parents	Spoken Approval
Kindergarten Teacher A		x	x	x	x	x
B	x	x	x	x	x	x
C	x	x	x	x		x
D	x	x	x	x	x	x
First Year Teacher A	x	x	x	x	x	x
B	x	x	x	x		x
C	x	x	x	x		x
D	x	x	x	x	x	x
Third Year Teacher A	x	x	x	x		x
B	x	x	x	x		x
C	x	x		x		x
D	x		x	x	x	x

PUNISHMENT	Low Grades	More Skill Drill	Denial or Withdrawal of Special Privileges	Denial or Withdrawal of Public Recognition	Notes to Parents	Spoken Disapproval
Kindergarten Teacher A			x	x	x	
B		x	x	x		x
C		x	x	x		x
D		x	x	x	x	x

PUNISHMENT		Low Grades	More Skill Drill	Denial or Withdrawal of Special Privileges	Denial or Withdrawal of Public Recognition	Notes to Parents	Spoken Disapproval
First Year Teacher	A	x		x	x	x	x
	B	x	x	x	x	x	x
	C	x	x	x	x		x
	D	x		x	x	x	x
Third Year Teacher	A	x	x	x	x		x
	B	x		x	x		x
	C	x	x	x	x	x	x
	D	x		x	x	x	x

BASIS OF REWARD-PUNISHMENT
(FOR WHAT GIVEN)

REWARD		Adequate and Superior Skill Achievement	Reasoning, Judgment, Insight, Conceptualism	Retention of Facts	Appropriate Behavior
Kindergarten Teacher	A	x	x		x
	B	x	x	x	x
	C	x	x	x	x
	D	x	x	x	x
First Year Teacher	A	x	x	x	x
	B	x	x	x	x
	C	x	x	x	x
	D	x	x	x	x
Third Year Teacher	A	x	x	x	x
	B	x		x	x
	C	x		x	x
	D	x	x	x	x

PUNISHMENT		Inadequate Skill Achievement	Lack of Reasoning ability Judgment, Insight Conceptualism	Inability to Retain Facts	Inappropriate Behavior
Kindergarten Teacher	A	x	x	x	x
	B	x	x	x	x
	C	x		x	x
	D	x	x	x	x

PUNISHMENT	Inadequate Skill Achievement	Lack of Reasoning ability Judgment, Insight Conceptualism	Inability to Retain Facts	Inappropriate Behavior
First Year				
Teacher A	x	x	x	x
B	x		x	x
C	x	x	x	x
D	x	x	x	x
Third Year				
Teacher A	x		x	x
B	x	x	x	x
C	x	x	x	x
D	x	x	x	x

Appendix C

TEACHER REENFORCEMENT

TEACHER REENFORCEMENT OF REWARD
NON-QUANTITATIVE

Kindergarten		Awarding of Status Privileges with Teacher	Utilizing Child as Group Leader to Teacher Assistant	Writing Notes to Parents	Displaying Child's work to class and guests	Giving Verbal praise and encouragement immediately	Revealing teacher feelings
Teacher	A	x	x	x	x	x	See (Appendix # B)
	B	x	x		x	x	
	C	x			x		
	D	x	x		x	x	
First Year							
Teacher	A	x	x		x	x	
	B	x	x		x	x	
	C			x	x		
	D	x	x	x	x	x	
Third Year							
Teacher	A	x	x		x	x	
	B	x	x	x	x	x	
	C				x	x	
	D	x	x	x	x	x	

TEACHER REENFORCEMENT OF REWARD
QUANTITATIVE

		High Grades	Movement to advanced work (or group)
Kindergarten Teacher	A	x	x
	B	x	x
	C	x	
	D	x	x
First Year Teacher	A	x	x
	B	x	
	C	x	
	D	x	x
Third Year Teacher	A	x	x
	B	x	x
	C	x	
	D	x	x

Appendix D

TEACHER ATTITUDE BEHAVIOR

TEACHER ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR REVEALING FEELINGS
NOTE: See discussion for apparent conflict of items

Teacher Voice Tone and Language Style	SOFT	FIRM	GENTLE	ACCEPTING	LOUD	HARSH	STERN	REJECTING
Kindergarten								
A	x	x	x	x			x	x
B		x	x	x			x	
C		x	x	x			x	x
D	x	x		x			x	
First Year								
A		x	x	x				
B		x		x	x			
C		x		x				
D		x	x	x		x	x	x
Third Year								
A		x		x			x	x
B	x		x	x				x
C	x	x	x	x			x	x
D	x		x	x				x

Teacher Facial and Body Attitude	SMILING	RESPECTFUL	PATIENT	CALM	APPROVING	FROWNING	CONTEMPTUOUS	IMPATIENT	ANGRY	DISAPPROVING
Kindergarten										
A	x	x	x	x	x	x				x
B	x	x			x	x		x		x
C		x	x	x	x	x				x
D		x	x		x	x		x		x
First Year										
A	x	x	x	x	x	x				x
B		x	x		x		x			x
C			x	x	x	x	x			x
D	x	x	x		x			x		x
Third Year										
A		x	x		x					
B		x	x				x	x		
C	x	x			x	x		x		x
D	x	x	x	x	x	x				x

Appendix E

TEACHER-PARENT CONFERENCES
TEACHER-TEACHER MEETINGS

OBSERVATION: TEACHER-PARENT CONFERENCES
TEACHER-TEACHER MEETINGS

TEACHER-PARENT CONFERENCES

	Achievement Oriented Comments	Behavior-Oriented Comments
Kindergarten Teacher A	7	11
B	8	13
C	8	10
D	11	5
First Year Teacher A	11	12
B	12	11
C	13	17
D	11	9
Third Year Teacher A	21	11
B	12	9
C	13	5
D	11	7

TEACHER-TEACHER MEETINGS

Kindergarten Teacher A	11	13
B	13	17
C	15	9
D	8	12
First Year Teacher A	15	13
B	17	11
C	11	11
D	12	14
Third Year Teacher A	21	16
B	19	18
C	23	13
D	25	16

Appendix F

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

	Principals				District Superintendent			Associate Superintendents		
	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	A	B	C
1. What should determine pupil placement?										
Tests - Standardized	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Tests - Philadelphia's	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Tests - Teacher	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Teacher evaluation	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2. What does determine pupil placement?										
Tests - Standardized	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Tests - Philadelphia's	x	x		x						
Tests - Teacher		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Teacher recommendation		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Parent intervention	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3. How often are children re-grouped?										
Rarely	x	x	x		x	x	x			
Every time there is a Progress Report period		x	x	x				x	x	x
September and June	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Whenever necessary for pupil growth				x				x	x	x
4. How often should children be regrouped?										
Whenever there is reason				x	x	x	x	x	x	x
When testing indicates	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
When the teacher chooses				x						
Not often, too disruptive to class	x	x								
Often, to meet growth needs				x	x	x	x	x	x	x

(Interview Schedule for Administrators Continued)

	Principals				District Superintendent			Associate Superintendents		
	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	A	B	C
5. What part do you play in deciding pupil placement?										
None		x			x	x	x	x	x	x
Approve or disapprove	x		x							
Initiating role after test scores are received				x						
As little and as much as teachers request	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			

Appendix G

ADMINISTRATIVE VIEW OF ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

ADMINISTRATIVE VIEW
OF
ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

	Standardized tests Adequate	Standardized tests plus teacher evaluation	All current means inadequate
Principal A		x	
B			x
C			x
District Superintendent			x
Associate Superintendent for Curriculum			x
Testing Division Personnel	x		
Guidance and Pupil Service Personnel			x
Superintendent of Schools			x

All administrative personnel felt that the standardized tests were defensible but not capable of adequate prognosis of evaluation.

Appendix H

TEACHER COMMENTS ON ASSESSMENT BASES TO CHILDREN DURING CLASS

TEACHER COMMENTS
ON
ASSESSMENT BASES TO CHILDREN
DURING CLASS
(five one-half day observation periods)

		Standardized Tests	Classwork on Basic Skills	Teacher Tests	Social Skills
Kindergarten Teacher	A	8	23	10	17
	B	9	15	14	10
	C	8	17	12	11
	D	9	18	11	14
First Year Teacher	A	16	11	17	9
	B	17	13	11	9
	C	19	15	11	7
	D	23	17	14	8
Third Year Teacher	A	25	17	21	11
	B	22	16	23	12
	C	21	18	27	10
	D	27	19	19	13

Appendix I

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS AND GROUPED RESPONSES

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
1. What do you expect of children entering your class?				
1. Toilet trained	x	x	x	x
2. Clean		x	x	
3. Able to handle most of their clothes alone	x	x	x	x
4. Recognize advertisements from seeing them in magazines and on TV	x	x		x
5. Know their name	x	x	x	x
6. Know names of family	x	x	x	x
7. Know where they live	x	x	x	x
8. Know how to play with others	x	x	x	
9. Know how to play alone		x		x
10. Know how to eat with (reasonable) ease	x	x	x	x
11. Capable of recognizing normal objects of daily living--books, radio, TV, tooth brush, glasses, dishes, utensils, buses, cars, planes, clothing items	x	x	x	x
12. Have a conversational vocabulary of words and simple sentences	x		x	x
13. Able to learn and play games	x	x	x	x
14. Know how to follow simple directions	x			x
15. Able to recognize a few words by association with objects		x		
2. Do you have an achievement time schedule for what you believe to be basic skills?	yes	yes	yes	yes
3. How did you arrive at that schedule?				
1. Experience of the past with children	x	x	x	x
2. What was needed for first grade teacher	x			x
3. What the curriculum guide required		x		x

(Kindergarten Continued)

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
4. What records do you maintain on each child?				
1. Occasional notes in roll book (planbook)	x	x		x
2. Anecdotal records--folder on each child	x		x	
3. Comments from daily planning on varying individuals	x	x		x
5. Of what use are these records?				
1. Used to plan work for children	x	x	x	x
2. Used to discuss child with parents and others during year	x	x	x	x
3. Used to recommend placement in first grade	x	x	x	x
6. What kind of information would you ideally like to have about each child before he enters your class? *See discussion which follows chart	*	*	*	*
7. Why? How would you use it? *See discussion which follows chart	*	*	*	*
8. In what way would such information be likely to change your day to day operations? *See discussion which follows chart	*	*	*	*
9. What kind of information do you pass on to the next teacher(s) who deal with your present pupils?				
1. Skill achievement level	x	x	x	x
2. Personality problems	x	x	x	x
3. Home situation where known	x	x	x	x
4. Play and work habits	x	x	x	x
5. Attitude toward school	x	x		x
6. Attitude toward teacher	x	x		
7. Attitude toward other children	x	x	x	x
8. Absence and lateness record	x	x	x	x
9. Health data	x	x	x	x
10. Strengths and weakness	x			
11. Achievement prognosis	x	x	x	

(Kindergarten Continued)

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
10. How do you decide on your recommendations for relation movement or promotion?				
1. On the basis of my record	x	x	x	x
2. On the basis what seems best for the child	x	x		
3. By discussing it with parents	x		x	x
4. By discussing it with principal and/or guidance or helping teacher	x	x	x	
5. By discussing it with receiving teacher	x	x		
6. On the basis of Central Office tests	x	x	x	x
11. What do you believe to be the single most important factor in your evaluation of a child's progress				
1. Standard tests (Central Administration tests)		x	x	
2. Classroom work	x			
3. Teacher tests				x
4. Social adjustment				
12. With what kind of child do you feel you are the most successful?				
1. Well-behaved ones		x		x
2. Bright ones who learn quickly		x		
3. Those who need the most help	x			
4. Girls				x
5. Boys			x	
6. Alert, creative ones		x		x
7. The too quiet ones	x			
8. The dull ones	x		x	

(Kindergarten Continued)

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 6 - Information desired by these teachers ranged from full knowledge of home, family, income level, achievement level to the teacher who indicated she would prefer to teach the child her own way in her own time with her own materials. This teacher (A) came closest to seeking some understanding about the cognitive style of her pupils as well as their cognitive achievement-development.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 7 - Responses here were vague. There was only some feeling that "the information would help" but no indication of "help" to do what.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 8 - Responses here emphasized more concern with the teachers emotional stance and needs than with their teaching method. "I'd be more patient, more understanding." "I'd know how far to push the child and myself." "I could understand the child's behavior better." "I'd know what to expect."

Appendix J

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR FIRST YEAR TEACHERS AND GROUPED RESPONSES

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
1. How do you utilize the information given you by the kindergarten teacher?				
1. Use it to organize pupil groupings	x	x	x	x
2. Use it to plan classwork in the beginning	x			
3. Use it to prepare material	x		x	x
4. Use it to prepare myself for the group	x		x	
2. How do you assign your pupils to groups?				
1. By tests--Central Office	x	x	x	x
2. By tests--teacher designed	x		x	x
3. By experimentation	x	x		
4. By observation of pupils	x		x	
5. By balancing out size of groups where pupils are all on same level		x	x	
6. In consultation with principal and/or other helping personnel	x	x	x	x
3. On what basis do you re-group pupils?				
1. Performance in class	x	x	x	x
2. Teacher tests	x	x	x	x
3. Central Office tests	x	x	x	x
4. Observation	x	x	x	x
5. Behavior problems		x	x	x
6. Learning problems	x	x	x	x
7. Social reasons (includes such things as judgments "as to whether certain pupils should be together", dominance and reticence factors)	x		x	x
8. Concern for pupil morale (encouragement, reward)	x	x	x	x
9. Request and/or recommendation of supervisory (helping) personnel				

(First Year Continued)

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
4. What differences do you find between children who have had a pre-school experience and those who have not? *See discussions which follow chart	*	*	*	*
5. What adjustments do you make to deal with these differences? *See discussions which follow chart	*	*	*	*
6. Does the Continuous Progress Primary organization give you greater flexibility in dealing with your pupils? If yes, how do you utilize that flexibility? If not, why not? *See discussions which follow chart	*	*	*	*
7. What kind of records do you keep on each child?				
1. None other than cumulative record card and roll book			x	
2. In addition to cumulative record card, anecdotes in a folder for the class		x		x
3. Separate folder for each child	x			
4. Notes in lesson plan book	x	x	x	
5. Card file				x
8. How do you use the test batteries prescribed by the central administration? *See discussions which follow chart	*	*	*	*
9. Upon what single factor do you place the most emphasis in evaluating pupil progress?				
1. Standard tests (Central Administration tests)				x
2. Classroom work	x			
3. Teacher tests			x	
4. Social adjustment		x		

(First Year Continued)

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
10. How do you assess a child's present capabilities?				
1. Standardized tests	x	x	x	x
2. Teacher tests	x	x	x	x
3. Observation	x		x	x
4. Comparison with other children	x		x	x
5. By previous experience	x	x		
11. What factors most influence your decision to assign a child to another group? See discussions which follow chart	*	*	*	*
12. With what kind of child do you feel you are most successful?				
1. Slow learners				x
2. Bright, quick and interested			x	
3. Non-white		x		
4. Quiet and shy	x			

(First Year Continued)

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 4 - Each of the teachers indicated that there was a greater knowledge of what was expected of them by the children who had had a pre-school experience. It must be noted, however, that there were value elements in the responses, one comment: "They are easier to deal with because they expect a routine and generally do what I ask if they have been in kindergarten. If they have had nursery school but no kindergarten they often have gone back to their bad home habits. It's harder to make them behave properly." And another: Sometimes the children who have had kindergarten experience are so much better, behave more the way they should that I think they are brighter even though they are not. It's so easy to think a child is bright if he is well-behaved and understands the school routine." One teacher (C) said that she didn't care whether the children had a kindergarten experience because she "had to do the same things anyway."

The responses clustered around the single difference of greater readiness to accept the school routine, to respond more easily to the expectations of the school.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 5 - Here the range of answers was significant for the light it sheds upon the teacher's view of the child.

TEACHER A - "Where children seem immature because they had a kindergarten experience, I try to give them things to do early to help them catch up. They have so little experience I can use (emphasis writer's). Sometimes I group them separately; sometimes I put them with kindergarten children who can act as leaders. It's so hard to start out already behind everyone. I guess all teachers wish every child had a good home, good parents who cared

(First Year Continued)

and were bright. Most of my children don't have a chance. They'll have a tough time meeting the requirements of the upper grades and secondary school."

Teacher B - "I really can't adust very much. They have to meet the same standards so I just try to get them to catch up quickly. It's not easy most of the time."

Teacher C "Sometimes the children who have not had kindergarten are more mature because of their home situation but they don't really know anything about school except what their brothers and sisters have told them and that doesn't help much. I try to remember that they need more supervision, more help but when your group is large, it's easy to forget."

Teacher D - "I use whatever information I have to get the children in the right group. The tests help but it's very easy to see who has been in school before. They know more what to expect even though they don't always behave as if they do."

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 6 - General agreement prevailed here. The idea of an ungraded unit was good but the operation was poor. The comments ranged from less flexibility ("Not three grades but nine--all those reading levels!") to considerably more if the teachers would work together." Where there was more than two first year units there was more movement of pupils.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 8 - "I use those test batteries to check my own judgment of the child. I could be wrong."
"I use them to plan my work. I know what's expected so I work toward it."

(First Year Continued)

"I really don't use them. I look at them and see whether the children look the same on the test as they do to me."
"I use them as a guide."

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 11 - All four teachers included the standardized tests, their own tests and classwork as most influential factors. Two teachers (B and C) indicated parental concern had great influence and teacher (D) indicated that guidance and supervisory recommendation was of great importance. All teachers agreed that they felt more comfortable with a shared decision. "You must be careful. How can we really know?" I never feel I know enough about a child." "I know more about my children than tests show and more than their parents but I like to talk about them to some one else. I'd hate to ruin their whole school experience."

Significantly all teachers indicated that they relied on tests because they had no other quantitative means of assessment yet stated their belief that the standardized tests and even their own weren't good assessment devices.

Appendix K

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THIRD YEAR TEACHERS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THIRD YEAR TEACHERS AND GROUPED RESPONSES

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
1. On what factors will you place the most emphasis in recommending a child's retention or movement to fourth grade?				
1. Standard tests	x	x	x	x
2. Classwork	x	x	x	x
3. Teacher tests	x	x	x	x
4. Cumulative records	x	x	x	x
5. Social adjustment			x	
6. Work habits		x		x
7. Maturity and readiness	x		x	x
2. What in the child's previous record most influences your placement of him in a group?				
1. Previous teacher's recommendation	x		x	
2. Test scores (standardized)		x		
3. Cumulative record				x
3. What kind of information did you receive about your pupils? *See discussions which follow chart	*	*	*	*
4. What kind of information do you pass on to the next teacher?				
1. Whatever she asks for			x	
2. All my records on each child			x	x
3. Cumulative card and sample work	x		x	x
4. Written summary including family background	x		x	x
5. Nothing other than the regular test and standard data		x		

(Third Year Continued)

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES OF TEACHER			
	A	B	C	D
5. With what kind of child do you feel you are the most successful?				
1. Those who want to learn		x		x
2. Slow learners			x	
3. Cooperative and well-behaved				x
4. The "problem" ones	x			
6. How do you determine pupil progress?				
1. By basic skill achievement	x	x	x	
2. Score on standard tests	x	x		x
3. Classwork	x	x	x	x
4. Child's ability to make judgments		x	x	
5. Observation		x		x
6. Comparison with other children	x		x	x
7. What kind of fourth grade should your pupils have? *See discussions which follow chart	*	*	*	*

(Third Grade Continued)

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 3 - The responses here were varied in attitude, interpretation of the question and definition of information.
"Bad information. It's too full of someone else's ideas about the children. Only the test scores are accurate. Who knows about the rest?"
"I receive everything I ask for, everything available and sometimes I'm able to get some from outside school. I need it all."
"I don't get any information that really tells me how a child will perform. I get test scores, the usual material about his family but that's not really information."
Each teacher's response, however, indicated her view of the individuality of each child. There were comments such as "Just because the family's a mess doesn't mean the child is." Test scores don't tell everything. Two children can get the same score but they're different.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION 7 - Every teacher stated that their class should have an ungraded fourth grade with full emphasis upon ungraded.
"They all aren't ready for fourth grade. Some need to stay in the primary unit. Some need to be in fourth, fifth and sixth. Some in second. Some in all those grades."
All teachers responded in terms of (1) pupil need (2) the kind of teacher needed. The emphasis was upon the individuality of the child and his needs and the necessity for an "understanding" teacher.

E.DR
ED

FROM:

ERIC FACILITY
SUITE 601
1735 EYE STREET, N. W
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006